

1 LAW OFFICES OF DALE K. GALIPO  
2 Dale K. Galipo, (Bar No. 144074)  
3 dalekgalipo@yahoo.com  
4 21800 Burbank Boulevard, Suite 310  
5 Woodland Hills, California 91367  
6 Telephone: (818) 347-3333  
7 Facsimile: (818) 347-4118

8  
9 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

10  
11  
12  
13  
14

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
WESTERN DIVISION

15 MARK ANTHONY YOUNG,

16 Plaintiff,

17 vs.

18 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, et al.,

19 Defendants.

20 Case No. CV 08-5438-R (RZx)

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO  
DEFENDANTS' BILL OF COSTS**

Date: August 27, 2009

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Room: 917

Plaintiff Mark Anthony Young hereby objects to the Bill of Costs submitted by Defendants in connection with their Request to the Clerk to Tax Costs, filed on August 11, 2009. As set forth below, Defendants' request for costs must either be denied or reduced by at least \$2,179.28.

**I. THE BILL OF COSTS IS NOT SIGNED**

Because counsel for Defendants did not sign the Bill and thereby attest under penalty of perjury that the costs being sought were necessarily incurred and the services actually performed, the Bill of Costs should be rejected on this basis alone.

1       **II. EXPEDITED DEPOSITION COSTS ARE NOT TAXABLE**

2           Under Central District of California Local Rule 54-4.6, “non-expedited”  
3 transcripts are recoverable. Defendants appear to have properly deducted the “75%”  
4 charge for the expedited transcripts of Dr. Walker and Dr. Shipko’s depositions.  
5 However, Defendants seek to recover for \$1463.50 for Mr. Young’s deposition even  
6 though his \$1993.64 expedited deposition transcript would translate to only  
7 \$1139.22 (\$1993.64 / 1.75). This results in a net increase of \$324.22 over the  
8 recoverable amount. Accordingly, the Clerk should deny Defendants’ request  
9 insofar as it seeks \$324.22 in unrecoverable expedited deposition transcript costs.

10

11       **III. VIDEO DEPOSITION COSTS ARE NOT TAXABLE**

12           Under Central District of California Local Rule 54-4.6, certain deposition  
13 costs are taxable, “but not including the cost of videotaped or recorded depositions  
14 unless otherwise ordered by the Court,” or “the costs of video or audio technicians  
15 unless otherwise ordered by the Court.” L.R. 54-4.6(a), 54-4.6(b). There has been  
16 no order by the Court that these ordinarily unrecoverable costs may be recovered in  
17 this case. Accordingly, the Clerk should deny Defendants’ request insofar as it  
18 seeks \$1,855.00 in video deposition costs.

19           In sum, costs should be denied for lacking adequate proof they were  
20 necessarily incurred and the services necessarily performed. Alternatively, costs  
21 should be reduced by \$2,179.28 to comport with the Local Rules.

22

23           Respectfully submitted,

24 DATED: August 17, 2009

LAW OFFICES OF DALE K. GALIPO

25

26

Bv: \_\_\_\_\_ /s/ Dale K. Galipo \_\_\_\_\_

27

Dale K. Galipo  
Attorneys for Plaintiff

28